

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Examiner objected to the specification due to the use of the term “Velcro” in the specification. This informality has been corrected as shown in the **Amendments to the Specification**. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectful requested.

Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious over Gibbs et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,823,427) in view of Miller (U.S. Patent No. 2,980,427). As explained in greater detail below, the Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Gibbs or Miller. Claim 1 recites the following (underlining added for emphasis):

A spill cleaning device comprising:
a cleaning pad member;
at least one squeegee member connected to said cleaning
pad member and
at least one sachet member connected to said cleaning pad
member.

As discussed in greater detail in the present application, some embodiments of the present invention are directed toward a spill cleaning device which can collect liquid and solid debris from a surface. The spill cleaning device includes at least one squeegee. The spill cleaning device further includes a sachet member containing a cleaner and/or a sanitizer to clean the surface after the debris is collected. The spill cleaning device is designed for simple operation and to eliminate the need for multiple items to clean a spill.


In contrast, Gibbs teaches a dust mop head cover and Miller teaches a cleaning sheet having capsules containing a liquid cleaner. However, neither reference teaches or suggests a spill cleaning tool having a cleaning pad, a squeegee, and a sachet. Specifically, Gibbs teaches a cleaning pad, but does not teach or suggest a squeegee or sachet. Miller teaches a

cleaning pad including a sachet, but does not teach or suggest a squeegee coupled to the pad. Thus, the combination of these references fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because neither reference teaches or suggests at least one element of the claimed device. Specifically, neither reference teaches or suggests a squeegee. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in the art as to why a squeegee should be added to these two references. Therefore, in view of the arguments presented, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-21 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, and also because they contain additional patentable subject matter, which for the sake of brevity is not discussed.

Independent claims 22 and 34 also require a squeegee. Since Gibbs and Miller are absent a teaching of a squeegee, independent claims 22 and 34 are allowable. Claims 23-33 and 35-43 depend from claim 22 and 34, respectively. As such, claims 23-33 and 35-43 are also allowable for the same reasons as claims 22 and 34, and also because they contain additional patentable subject matter, which for the sake of brevity is not discussed.

In view of the remarks presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Applicants kindly request that the Examiner call the attorneys of record in the event a telephone discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,


Gregory S. Bollis
Reg. No. 52,630

JohnsonDiversey, Inc.
8310 16th Street
P.O. Box 902
Sturtevant, WI 53177-0902
262-631-4593

Customer No. 24804